REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 8-14 are pending in the application. In this amendment, claims 1-4 and 6 have been amended. In addition, claims 16-19 are added. Claims 5 and 7-15 are deleted herein. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests recondideration of the claims in view of the following remarks.

PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

Claims 1-6 and 8-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vanttinen in view of Clubb et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites in pertinent part:

> A handing method for providing a client with a location estimate of a target User Equipment (UE), the method comprising the steps of:
> ****
> **after receiving the Location Information message**, the client, attempting to process the location estimate of the target UE, and sending to the LCS system a Location Information Acknowledgement message wherein **(a) if the client is unable to process the location estimate of the target UE, the Location Information Acknowledgement message includes a cause of failure, and (b) if the client is able to process the location estimate of the target UE, the Location Information Acknowledgement message includes an indication that the location estimate of the target UE has been processed successfully. (emphasis added)**

As the Examiner acknowledged in the -Office Action, Vanttinen does not disclose the recited element of independent claim 1 of client handling of a target UE location estimate (*see* Office Action 1/27/10, p. 6), which has been further ameneded herein to recite in pertinent part:

> "**after receiving the Location Information message** ... and sending to the LCS system a Location Information Acknowledgement message, wherein **(a) if the client is unable to process the location estimate of the target UE, the Location Information Acknowledgement message includes a cause of failure, and (b) if the client is able to process the location estimate of the target UE, the Location Information Acknowledgement message includes an indication that the location estimate of the target UE has been processed successfully.**"

In an effort to address some of the foregoing deficiencies of Vanttinen, the Examiner proposed the combination of the Vanttinen with Clubb.

Howerver, applicant respectfully submits that Clubb does not overcome the deficiencies acknowledged by the Examiner with respect to Vanttinen. Specificially, Clubb fails to teach or suggest the recited aspect of claim 1 (as amended herein) of a clinet **"after receiving the Location Information message, ...**and sending to the LCS system a Location Information Acknowledgement message, wherein **(a) if the client is unable to process the location estimate of the target UE, the Location Information Acknowledgement message includes a cause of failure, and (b) if the client is able to process the location estimate of the target UE, the Location Information Acknowledgement message includes an indication that the location estimate of the target UE has been processed successfully"**.

Instead, Clubb states that the client device responds with an acknowledgement message back to the protocol gateway 118 which confirms the client has received the information sent from BES 122. (see Fig. 7A, and Para 0423-0429). Furthermore, Clubb states that an acknowledgement 714 sent from client device 112 to protocol gateway 116. PG 116 can send acknowledgment of receipt of the complet multi-segment message. (see Fig. 7B, and Para 0434-0438). But Clubb does not disclose that **"(a)** if the client is unable to process the location estimate of the target UE, **the Location Information Acknowledgement message includes a cause of failure"**

To the contrary, Clubb states that "A non-acknowledegement message may be received at the message router. The non-acknowledgement message indicates a **message intended for a client device failed to reach the client device"** (see Para 24). In other words, Clubb teaches that when **the client device does not receive the message,** the non-acknowledgement message is sent. So Clubb teaches away from the limitation **"after receiving the Location Information message, ..,** and sending to the LCS system a Location Information Acknowledgement message" of claim 1.

Furthermore, Clubb states that "if the number of transmission attempts for the message segment has exceeded the configured number of retry attempts, the application is notified with message type of **AIM_NACK_MESSAGE ...**and **the 2 byte error code containing the reason why the message was not delivered"** (see Para 552). The 2 byte error code containing the reason why the message was not delivered in Clubb is <u>not</u> a cause of failure for processing the location estimate of the target UE, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over any combination of Vanttinen and Clubb for at least the reasons discussed above. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 under under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 2-4 and 6 depend from claim 1 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable over the references of record in view of their dependence on an allowable claims as well as the additional limitations.

Newly submitted Independent claim 17 recites a method of processing location information of a target UE that includes the step "after receiving the Location Information message...wherein (a) if the client is unable to process the location estimate of the target UE, the Location Information Acknowledgement message includes a cause of failure, and (b) if the client is able to process the location estimate of the target UE, the Location Information Acknowledgement message includes an indication that the location estimate of the target UE has been processed successfully". Applicant respectfully submits that new independt claim 17 is allowable over the reference of record for at least the foregoing reason.

Dependent claims 18 and 19 depend from claim 17 and add new further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable over the references of record in view of their dependence on an allowable claims as well as the additional limitations.

[Remainder of page intentionally blank]

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance. It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejections have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections.

If there are any other issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any unpaid fees deemed required in connection with this submission, including any additional filing or application processing fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.16 or 1.17, or to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 504983.

Respectfully submitted,
Attorney for Applicant

Dated: May 25, 2010

By

Paul C. Hashim
Registration No.: 31,618
Futurewei Technologies, Inc.
Tel: (972) 543-5840
Email: phashim@huawei.com